



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*EVERY WOMAN IN HER HUMOR AND THE DUMB  
KNIGHT*

**"Every Woman in Her Humor."**—*Every Woman in Her Humor* was printed in 1609 with the following scant title-page: "Everie Woman in her Humor. London. Printed by E. A. for *Thomas Archer*, and are to be solde at his shop in the *Popes-head-Pallace*, neere the Royall Exchange. 1609." The play, as its name indicates, is an imitation in part of Jonson's two early comedies of humor; and it is frankly indebted for the suggestion of several of its characters and some of its plot, to *Every Man Out of His Humour*. Mr. Bullen, who reprinted the play in his *Collection of Old English Plays*, speaks highly of its merits:

The jolly fat host, with his cheery cry, "merry hearts live long," is pleasant company; and his wife, the hard-working hostess, constantly repining at her lot, yet seemingly not dissatisfied at heart, has the appearance of being a faithful transcript from life. Cornutus (the hen-pecked citizen) and his gadding wife are familiar figures, but not the less welcome on that account. Getica's anxiety at the loss of her dog is amusingly depicted.

The title-page of the play gives no indication of its authorship, and so far no one has been able to venture a suggestion on this point; even Fleay, with his wide knowledge of the Tudor-Stuart drama, and his extraordinary daring in such matters, has had to confess himself at a loss: "I do not pretend," says he, "to guess at the authorship."<sup>1</sup>

**"The Dumb Knight" and Its Two Authors.**—*The Dumb Knight* was entered in the Stationers' Registers on October 6, 1608, and was printed shortly after, with the statement that it had been "acted sundry times by the children of his Maiesties Revels." It was the product of two writers, Lewis Machin, who signs the address "To the Understanding Reader," and Gervase Markham, whose name appears on the title-page of some copies.

Of Machin nothing seems to be known, except that his name is affixed to "three Eglogs" at the end of William Barkstead's *Mirrha*,

<sup>1</sup> *Biog. Chron. Eng. Drama*, II, 322.

*the Mother of Adonis* (1607). Neither Winstanley nor Langbaine tells us anything about him, and *The Dictionary of National Biography* gives merely a passing reference to him in its article on Henry Machin.<sup>1</sup>

Markham was a versatile writer, "whose worth," as his collaborator Machin truly says, "hath been often approved." He is best known, perhaps, as a voluminous author of books on husbandry; but in his long poem, *The Tragedie of Sir Richard Grinuile* (1595),<sup>2</sup> written in ottava rima and full of rich imagery, he shows himself to be a poet of no mean ability; and in *The Teares of the Beloved* (1600) and *Marie Magdalene's Teares* (1601)<sup>3</sup>, he reveals a serious and lofty vein. Grosart says of this poetry: "It is quiet, tranquil, simple, with only now and again a touch of pathos or quaint symbolism. Occasionally, too, there are things that lay hold of and stick to the memory." Markham was not intimately connected with theatrical affairs; and although he later collaborated with William Sampson on another play, *The True Tragedy of Herod and Antipater: With the Death of faire Marriam, According to Josephus the learned and famous Jewe*,<sup>4</sup> we may suppose that he was relatively unfamiliar with dramatic composition.

**A Division of the Work of the Two Authors.**—It is easy to distinguish between the work of the two collaborators. One of them, obviously, composed the serious main plot, written in smooth blank verse that is sometimes illuminated by beautiful passages, and is always rich in poetic imagery; the other, obviously, contributed the comic sub-plot, written for the most part in prose, full of coarse humor, and abounding in the most indelicate allusions. But not only are the two plots distinct in manner; they are separate and complete units, dealing each with virtually a different set of characters. Furthermore, they are inadequately and inartistically

<sup>1</sup> Fleay, with unusual rashness, assigns to him *The Fair Maid of the West* (*Biog. Chron. Eng. Drama*, II, 329-30).

<sup>2</sup> Reprinted in Arber's *English Reprints*. Tennyson is said to have been indebted to the poem for some of the imagery in *The Revenge*.

<sup>3</sup> These two poems are reprinted by Grosart in *Miscellanies of the Fuller Worthies' Library*, II (1871).

<sup>4</sup> This play has not been reprinted, but a full description is given in Mr. Arthur Cyril Dunstan's *Examination of Two English Dramas*, a Königsberg dissertation, 1908. Professor Schelling assigns the play to 1621.

joined. The inconsistency and the incongruity of the sub-plot, wherever it touches the main plot, is to the careful reader painfully obvious. A close study of the play leads to the almost inevitable conclusion that the two authors did not write in intimate collaboration. The main plot, I believe, was first composed in a serious vein, without any comic relief; later, to the second author was given (probably by the theatrical manager) the task of fitting the play with a humorous sub-plot. In itself this sub-plot is successful enough (perhaps exactly what the theatrical manager wanted), but its author has shown little skill in uniting it to the main story. To accomplish a linking he took a relatively unimportant character in the main plot, Lord Alphonso, and made him the chief character in the sub-plot: or, to be more exact, he borrowed the name "Lord Alphonso" for one of his leading comic characters; for we find great difficulty in reconciling the original Lord Alphonso, the lofty "marshall of the realm" and the Queen's champion, with the libertine that we are called upon to laugh at in the comic scenes. The author of the serious plot conceived the character of Alphonso thus:<sup>1</sup>

*Cyp.* Who are your combatants?  
*Queen* . . . . The next Alphonso, sprung from noble blood,  
Who laden with rich Lusitanian prize  
Hath rode through Syracuse twice in pomp.

And to the Duke of Cyprus, Alphonso says:

Nay more, we are the sons of destiny,  
Virtue's our guide, our aim is dignity.

Yet the writer of the sub-plot turned this nobly conceived character into a silly lecher, the victim of a coarse joke, in which he is anything but dignified.

The taking of Alphonso for this purpose led to other inconsistencies. For example, the author of the sub-plot creates the character of Mechant, a petitioner to Prate the Orator. He first appears in the second act (p. 137) with two other petitioners, Drap, "a country gentleman," and Velours, "a citizen," where he speaks only one line; in a later scene he explains his presence in the play with

<sup>1</sup> Here and throughout this paper I quote from the edition of *The Dumb Knight* in Hazlitt's Dodsley, Vol. X.

a statement that is wholly unprepared for and highly improbable (p. 144); and to seek redress for his wrongs at the hands of the Queen ("The Queen, out of suspicion . . . casts me from favour, seizes all my lands, and turns my naked fortunes to the cold"), he humbly petitions several noblemen to arrange for him an audience with the King. The noblemen, however, contemptuously refer him ("they despise and slight" him "in their meanest compliments") to Prate the Orator, who scornfully tells him to "go home, repent, pray, and die." But in Act IV we are astonished to find this same Mechant an honored guest at a private dance in the royal palace, talking pleasantly in the company of the Queen who had so wronged him, and dancing as the elected partner of the Duke's sister, Mariana. I feel sure that in this scene, as originally written by the author of the serious plot, Mariana's dancing partner was Lord Alphonso (who elsewhere is her good friend; cf. pp. 151-52, 153); but the arranger of the sub-plot could not allow Alphonso to appear in this scene, for at that very time the Alphonso of the sub-plot was walking the street in the clothes of Prate the Orator, and in the scene immediately following must be arrested in that ludicrous costume. Apparently the author of the sub-plot merely changed the catch-word "*Alph.*" to "*Mech.*" Again, in a subsequent scene (p. 193), for the same reasons, he makes the same change, although it results in representing the King as having entrusted to Mechant a highly important commission—exactly such a commission as he would have entrusted to Alphonso, the marshal of the realm.

Another bit of evidence for believing that the sub-plot was a later product inartistically fused with the main plot is to be found in its chronology. According to the sub-plot not more than a day and a half has elapsed between the beginning and the end of the play, for Alphonso and Prate have not had time at the final scene to change their ridiculous costumes; yet, according to the main plot, several weeks must have elapsed.

Further evidence, if it were needed, could be adduced to prove that the main plot was written first, and that the sub-plot was later and inartistically added for comic relief.

**Markham the Author of the Main Plot.**—To Markham, without much doubt, should be attributed the dignified heroic plot in blank

verse.<sup>1</sup> It clearly reveals the ready hand of an experienced poet; and although the effect of the play as a whole may not be impressive, its serious parts contain many individual passages of beauty. The numerous references to classical themes, too, indicate an extensive and intimate knowledge of ancient writers. In this respect the play resembles *The Tragedie of Sir Richard Grinuile*. Markham, we know, was an excellent classical scholar, and was also versed in French, Italian, Spanish, and probably Dutch literature. This broad reading reveals itself, unobtrusively but surely, in the lines of the main plot.

Again, the main plot is notable, like *Sir Richard Grinuile*, for its laudation of high ideals of valor. In order to realize this fully, the reader should examine the serious plot by itself. Cyprus says to his Iago-like friend, Duke Epire:

Duke, thou art valiant, and with a valiant mind  
Slander is worse than theft or sacrilege.

And before the combat Florio says:

This day shall stand two famous monuments;  
The one a throne of glory bright as gold,  
Burnish'd with angel's lustre, and with stars  
Pluck'd from the crown of conquest, in which shall sit  
Men made half-gods through famous victory.

The last line may be an echo from Markham's *Richard Grinuile*:

And for his valor half a God did make.<sup>2</sup>

It should be remembered, too, that Markham was a soldier of distinction. Langbaine speaks highly of his military career: "In the enumeration of his Works the Reader will be satisfied of his excellent

<sup>1</sup> Fleay, *Biog. Chron. Eng. Drama*, II, 58, attributes to Markham, on no evidence, the comic sub-plot; then later in the same volume (p. 330) attributes the sub-plot to Machin. In the latter case, he uses the attribution to prove that Machin wrote *The Fair Maid of the Exchange*.

<sup>2</sup> Arber's *Reprint*, p. 85; cf. also:

That men half-gods shall call [p. 65].  
Making them gods for god-like victory [p. 76].

There seems to be a similarity in idea in the following passages:

Nor Death nor Fate  
Are slaves to fear, to hope, or human state.  
—*The Dumb Knight*, p. 132.  
In this unjust are Fate and Death declared,  
That mighty ones, no more than mean, are spared.  
—*Sir R. Grinuile*, p. 87.

Perhaps other similarities might be pointed out, although the themes are very different, and many years separate the two works.

Parts and Abilities: and that he was *tâm Marti quàm Mercurio*, vers'd in the Employments of War and Peace."

**Machin the Author of the Sub-Plot.**—The sub-plot we may safely attribute to Machin. So far as I can discover in reading the works of Markham, he is notably deficient in a sense of humor; this, however, cannot be said of the author of the sub-plot, for its comic scenes are highly amusing. Unfortunately, they are obscene beyond the usual license of the Elizabethan drama, and will, consequently, offend modern ears.

**Relation of "The Dumb Knight" to "Every Woman."**—That much of the comic stuff of *The Dumb Knight* is to be found in *Every Woman in Her Humor* seems not to have been observed. The two female characters of the sub-plot, Lollia and Collaquentida, are identical with the Hostess and the Citty Wife of the latter play, and in the first scene the language of these characters is repeated *verbatim*. In the rest of the play, too, and in other characters of *The Dumb Knight* we recognize bits of humor that appear in *Every Woman*. To indicate the extent and closeness of the borrowing in the first scene, I quote below a passage at length.

*The Dumb Knight*, pp. 121-23

*Lol.* Now fie upon 't, who would be an orator's wife, and not a gentlewoman, if she could choose? A lady is the most sweet lascivious life, congies and kisses—the tire, O the tire, made castle upon castle, jewel upon jewel, knot upon knot; crowns, garlands, gardings, and what not? the hood, the rebato, the French fall, the loose-bodied gown, the pin in the hair; no clawing the pate, then picking the teeth, and every day change; when we poor souls must come and go for every man's pleasure: and what's a lady more than another body? We have legs and hands, and rolling eyes, hanging lips, sleek brows, cherry cheeks, and other things as ladies have—but the fashion carries it away.

*Enter Mistress Collaquentida*

*Col.* Why how now, Mistress Prate? i' th' old disease still? will it never be better? cannot a woman find one kind man amongst twenty? O the days that I have seen, when the law of a woman's wit could have put her husband's purse to execution!

*Lol.* O Mistress Collaquentida, mine is even the unnaturallest man to his wife—

*Col.* Faith, for the most part all scholars are so, for they take so upon them to know all things, that indeed they know nothing; and besides they

“EVERY WOMAN IN HER HUMOR” AND “THE DUMB KNIGHT” 7

are with study and ease grown so unwieldy, that a woman shall ne’er want a sore stomach that’s troubled with them.

*Lol.* And yet they must have the government of all.

*Col.* True, and great reason they have for it: but a wise man will put it in a woman’s hand: what! she’ll save what he spends.

*Lol.* You have a pretty ruff, how deep is it?

*Col.* Nay this is but shallow; marry, I have a ruff is a quarter deep, measured by the yard.

*Lol.* Indeed! by the yard?

*Col.* By the standard, I assure you: you have a pretty set, too! how big is the steel you set with?

*Lol.* As big as a reasonable sufficient—

*Every Woman*, pp. 317–20

*Hostis.* Oh fye upont, who would be an hostis, & could do otherwise? [A] Ladie [h]as the most lascivious life, conges and kisses, the tyre, the hood, the rebato, the loose bodyed Gowne, the pin in the haire, and everie day change, when an Hostis must come and go at everye mans pleasure. And what’s a Lady more then another body? Wee have legs, and hands, rowling eyes and hanging lips, sleek browes, and cherie cheeks & other things as Ladies have, but the fashion carries it away.

*Enter Cittizens Wife*<sup>1</sup>

*City W.* Why how now, woman, a ’th olde disease still? will it never be better? cannot a Woman finde one kinde man amongst twentie? Ah the daies I have seen, when a Womans will was a lawe: If I had a mind to such a thing, or such a thing, I could have had it, but twa’s never better since men were Purse-bearers.

*Hosty.* Mine is een the unnaturallist man to his Wife.

*Cittie wi.* Truely, and commonly are all such fat men: ile tell thee, Gossip, I have buried sixe, I, sixe husbands, but if I should live to have as many more, as I know not what may happen, but sure Ide never have such a fatte man: they be the most unweldey men: that woman shall not want a sore stomach, that’s troubled with them, I warrant her.<sup>2</sup>

*Hostis.* And yet they must have the government of all.

*City w.* And great reason they have for it, but a wise man will put [it] in a Woman’s hand: what sheele save that hee spends.

*Hostis.* You have a pretty Ruffe, how deepe is it?

*City w.* Nay this is but shallowe, marrie I have a Ruffe is a quarter deepe, measured by the yard.

*Hostis.* Indeece, by the yard.

<sup>1</sup> In meantime, the Host has come upon the stage and reproached the Hostess for not looking to the guests. I have omitted twenty-six lines.

<sup>2</sup> At this point I have omitted eighteen lines.



*City w.* By the standard: you have a pretty set, too, how big is the steele you set it with?

*Hostis.* As bigge as a reasonable sufficient—

**“Every Woman” Written First.**—A close examination of the two plays leads to the conclusion that *Every Woman* was written first, and that its comic material was drawn upon by Machin to piece out the sub-plot of *The Dumb Knight*. In *Every Woman* the puns and the humorous language seem more spontaneous and to suit the characters and the situation more perfectly; in *The Dumb Knight*, on the other hand, the author seems at times to go out of his way to bring in the successful wit of the other play. For example, in the passage I have quoted, it will be observed that the bitter complaint of Lollia (“Who would be an orator’s wife, and not a gentlewoman?”) is much less appropriate in the mouth of the wife of Prate, the King’s Orator, who has charge of the government’s most important business, and who rides upon his foot-cloth, than in the mouth of the hostess of the Hobbie who is constantly being summoned by her husband and his apprentices to look after the business of the tavern. Likewise, the line, “we poor souls must come and go for every man’s pleasure,” is quite inappropriate in the mouth of Lollia, but perfectly appropriate in the mouth of the Hostess, who is being loudly called every few minutes to “look about to the guests.” Again, the reference to Prate as being very fat is not supported by the rest of the play (for example, Lord Alphonso’s clothes fit him to a hair), but in *Every Woman* the host is represented in all the scenes as fat and jolly. Doubtless this explains why in *The Dumb Knight* the remarks about fatness are abbreviated and somewhat modified—the only part of the passage that is seriously altered. The satire on feminine dress, introduced into *The Dumb Knight* without special cause, is also far more appropriate in *Every Woman in Her Humor*, where the author is engaged throughout in satirizing women and in particular their absurdities in costume. Again, the last speech of the passage quoted is suddenly interrupted in *Every Woman* by the entrance of an apprentice summoning the hostess in the name of her husband to “come in” at once; in *The Dumb Knight* there is nothing to explain the incompleteness of the sentence, and modern editors have felt obliged to emend the line.

Finally, on p. 123 Lollia says: "If my husband should rise from his study and miss me, we should have such a coil"; but no cause for this extraordinary apprehension is given. In *Every Woman* this speech is perfectly intelligible; for the Host had once summoned his wife in person, and then upon her failure to come, had twice dispatched his apprentices for her; at the last summons, the Hostess says to her gossip: "By my troth, I must goe, we shall have such a coyle else." Many more instances could be cited to prove that in *The Dumb Knight* Machin was borrowing—not creating—the humorous passages that figure in the two plays.<sup>1</sup>

**Machin the Author of "Every Woman."**—Since Machin gave *The Dumb Knight* to the press, and in a signed letter to the public confidently submits the play to speak for itself in answer to the sharp censure which envious persons had made against his share in the work, we may fairly presume, I think, that he was the author of the anonymous *Every Woman in Her Humor*. He would hardly have appealed with so much assurance to the "understanding" readers had he been guilty of an extensive and impudent plagiarism from the work of another and a contemporary playwright. Moreover, *Every Woman* was not printed until a year after the publication of *The Dumb Knight*; yet the closeness of the textual following (examine the passages I have quoted) indicates that Machin had the manuscript of *Every Woman* before him. Finally, and most important of all, the style of *Every Woman* outside the parallel passages suggests the author of the comic scenes in *The Dumb Knight*. The two plays, one feels, must have been the product of the same mind; the stock of ideas, the quality of the humor, the moral point of view, the tendency to preach, and the general manner of execution are similar. The way in which Mechant stands aloof and moralizes on the conduct of the persons in the sub-plot, and the way in which at the end of the play he brings the wrong-doers before the King, finds a counterpart in the conduct of Acutus in *Every Woman*. Precedent, in *The Dumb Knight*, reads passages from *Venus and Adonis*; Flaminius, in *Every Woman*, says: "Leave *Tulley* to the Ladies; he can tell them tales of *Venus* and *Adonis*, and that best pleaseth them"; the words

<sup>1</sup> Direct borrowing from *Every Woman* does not occur after the first scene. Apparently as soon as Machin got the sub-plot under way, he had little difficulty in keeping it going.

"standing" and "stiff" are overworked in both plays for the sake of puns; the satire against lawyers is conspicuous; and a curious mingling of obscenity and moralizing characterizes both.<sup>1</sup>

**The Date and Company of "Every Woman."**—The date of *Every Woman* and the company by which it was acted are problems which have puzzled commentators. Professor Thorndike, in *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, V, 31, boldly asserts that it was "acted by 1600," although he gives no reason for his belief; Professor Schelling, in *The Elizabethan Drama*, I, 471, says: "This production was first printed in 1609; but dates plainly from the last years of the old queen's reign." Professor Schelling probably was relying upon the questionable judgment of Fleay, who is himself doubtful: "The date of production was, I think, 1602."<sup>2</sup> Apparently all commentators on the play have felt it necessary to put the date of *Every Woman* as near as possible to the date of *Every Man in His Humour*, because of the obvious imitation in title. In the play itself, however, there is no evidence for such an early date; Fleay claims that it could not have been written before 1602; and one of the songs put into the mouth of Philautus, "Sister, awake, close not [your eyes]," first appeared in Bateson's *Madrigals* in 1604. The humor of Philautus was to sing snatches from songs that were more or less well known to the audience.

Beyond this no very definite evidence of the date of composition is to be found in the text. The extreme license of the language, however, is not in keeping with the plays of 1600, but is characteristic of many plays written in 1607 and later; and, in particular, it is characteristic of the plays produced by the Children of His Majestie's Revels at the Whitefriars Theatre. This troupe, which flourished in 1607-9, seems to have gone beyond all other companies in the obscenity of its plays. Compare *Ram Alley*, of which Ward, *English Dramatic Literature*, III, 157, says: "A comedy which appears to have earned much popularity by the extreme grossness of its fun"; *The Turke*, of which Isaac Reed, *Biographia Dramatica*, says: "This

<sup>1</sup> *The Dumb Knight* was printed "for Iohn Bache, and are to be sold at his shop in Popes-head Pallace, neere to the Royall Exchange," and *Every Woman* was printed "for Thomas Archer, and are to be solde at his shop in the Popes-head-Pallace, neere the Royall Exchange." *The Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers 1557-1640*, however does not indicate that Bache and Archer were at any time associated with each other.

<sup>2</sup> *Biog. Chron. Eng. Drama*, II, 322.

tragedy has some beautiful lines and speeches, which, however, are disgraced by intrusions of the lowest and most obscene comedy that has hitherto appeared on the stage"; *Cupid's Whirligig*, of which Professor Sampson, in his paper on "The Plays of Edward Sharpsham,"<sup>1</sup> says: "The plot . . . although less repulsive than that of *The Fleire*, is in detail coarser," and he mentions as one of its main characteristics "coarseness of language"; *The Family of Love*, to which Ward applies the adjective "coarse," and Professor Schelling, "gross"; *Humour out of Breath*, "which," says Ward, "has . . . divers lapses into what would be mildly described as indecorum"; and *The Dumb Knight*—which speaks for itself.

A reference in *Every Woman* to an exhibition of trained baboons may have some bearing on the date. On p. 270 we read:

I pray ye what shewe will be heere to night? I have seen the *Babones* already, and the *Cittie of new Ninivie* and *Julius Cæsar* acted by the Mammets.

Of course references to motions (i.e., puppet shows), particularly the old and well-known *Nineveh* and *Julius Caesar*, are common at all times; but the reference to the "shewe" of the baboons seems to be to a certain amusing performance by trained baboons that figures conspicuously in *Ram Alley*, written in 1607 for the Children of His Majestie's Revels. On pp. 279-80 (Hazlitt's Dodsley, X), we read: "They say some of our city dames Were much desirous to see the baboons Do their newest tricks"; and this is made the occasion of a long obscene anecdote. Again, in the same play (pp. 348-50), the performance of the baboons is imitated in a highly comic scene. Boutcher and Small-shanks make the braggart Captain Face sit upon a table and go through the several tricks of those animals. Small-shanks plays the part of the manager of the show, cracks his whip, makes a speech to an imaginary audience, and puts the unfortunate Captain through his paces.

*W. Small.* Remember, noble captain, you skip when I shall shake my whip. Now, sir, What can you do for the great Turk?

[*He performs.*]

What can you do for the Pope of Rome?

[*He performs.*]

What can you do for the town of Geneva, sirrah?

[*He holds up his hands instead of praying.*]

<sup>1</sup> *Studies in Language and Literature in Celebration of the Seventieth Birthday of James Morgan Hart.* New York, 1910.

Obviously the effectiveness of this scene would be greatly heightened by the popularity in 1607 of a particular baboon show; and two widely different and elaborate references in the same play of 1607 indicate that such was the case.

*Every Woman* was printed in 1609. Owing to pecuniary distress the Children of His Majestie's Revels disbanded early in 1609;<sup>1</sup> their plays were released to the printers, and most of them were issued at once. For a list of these see Fleay's *History of the Stage*, p. 188.

Since Machin's *Dumb Knight* was written for these Children in 1607-8, since his three eclogues were affixed to Barkstead's *Mirra* in 1607, since *Every Woman* is exactly the type of play acted by the Children, and since it was published in 1609, I am inclined to believe that it dates from about 1607, and that it probably belonged to the repertory of the Whitefriars troupe. The fact that its title imitates Jonson's two early comedies has here little weight; compare John Day's *Humour out of Breath*, written for the Children in 1607-8, of which Ward says: "The title was evidently suggested by the success of Jonson's two comedies." Perhaps there had been a recent revival of Jonson's two early "humour" plays.

**Surmises About Machin.**—In view of the total absence of biographical facts about Machin, perhaps a few observations, even though vague, drawn from a study of these plays, will be acceptable to the reader.

Machin belonged to a small group of playwrights who furnished plays to the Children of His Majestie's Revels at Whitefriars in 1607-9, and then disappeared entirely from the dramatic horizon. The other members of this group were Lordinge Barry, the author of *Ram Alley*, and John Mason, the author of *The Turke*.<sup>2</sup> Who these men were, where they came from, and what they did after the Whitefriars troupe disbanded, are unknown. Apparently they entered other walks of life; although in two cases, at least (Barry and Mason), they specifically promised additional plays provided their first efforts met with favor.

<sup>1</sup> See James Greenstreet, "The Whitefriars Theatre in the Time of Shakspeare," *New Shak. Soc. Trans.*, 1887-90.

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps I should also mention Edward Sharpham, who after writing *Cupid's Whirligig* disappears from view.

Barry and Mason were part owners of the playhouse; Machin's name, however, does not appear in the chancery suit<sup>1</sup> of February 1609, in which the sharers are several times named, nor is it likely, in view of the distressing condition of the company at that time, and its dissolution shortly after, that he subsequently became connected with its organization.

The company was called the Children of His Majestie's Revels, and of course the actors were in the main children. Yet it is possible that there were also grown-up actors associated with them. Furnivall, in commenting on the chancery suit referred to, says: "From the 'loss of their *places*' in clauses 5 and 8 of the Agreement below, it would seem that some of these six sharers were Players"; and Mr. P. A. Daniel is apparently of the same opinion. I do not believe, however, that the lawsuit furnishes any evidence on this point. Machin, to be sure, shows in several places in *Every Woman* an intimacy with the affairs of the playhouse:

As though none weare . . . . perywigges but Players [p. 318].

A comedian tongue is the onely perswasive ornament to win a Lady; why his discourse is as pleasant . . . . and keepe as good decorum; his prologue with obedience to the skirt; a rough Sceane of civill Warres, and a clapping conclusion; perhappes a Jigge [p. 329].

Tis even as common to see a Bason at a Church doore, as a Box<sup>2</sup> at a Playhouse [p. 352].

He would sweare like an Elephant, and stamp and stare (God bless us) like a play-house book-keeper when the actors miss their entrance [p. 354].

Prethee keepe the sceane till I fetch more actors to fill it fuller [p. 363].

But these passages do not necessarily indicate that Machin was an actor. They seem to emanate from a man who had quite recently become familiar with the life of the theater; and they may have been merely the result of his observation as an author, who like Ben Jonson, watched the staging of his play from behind the curtains.

We do not know that Machin was a university student. His name does not appear in the registers of Oxford, but he may, of course, have attended Cambridge. In both plays he shows some knowledge of classical mythology, and in *Every Woman* he quotes

<sup>1</sup> Printed by James Greenstreet in *New. Shak. Soc. Trans.*, 1887-90.

<sup>2</sup> The reference is to the box which the gatherer of the admission money held at the entrance to playhouses.

frequently from Latin authors. Perhaps the following passage from the latter play suggests the attitude of a university student:

*Acut.* More Ladies *Terentias*, I crie still,  
That prise a saint before a Silken foole.  
She that loves true learning and pomp disdaines  
Treads on *Tartarus* and *Olimpus* gaines.

*Grac.* I marrie, but then would learning be in  
colours, proud, proud; then would not foure nobles  
purchase a benefice, two Sermons in a years.

*Accut.* I, *Graccus*, now thou hitst the finger right  
Upon the shoulder of Ingratitude.  
Thou hast clapt an action of flat felony;  
Now, ill betide that partiall judgement  
That doomes a farmers rich adultus  
To the supremacie of a Deanrie,  
When needie, yet true grounded Discipline,  
Is govern'd with a threed bare Vycarage.<sup>1</sup>

It seems likely from his exceptional knowledge of law, his frequent use of legal terms, and his continual good-natured satire against lawyers, that he was a young member of that profession. The extraordinary legal knowledge displayed in *Ram Alley* makes it likely that Lordinge Barry also was a lawyer. Perhaps, since Barry was the prime mover in the Whitefriars undertaking, he interested some of his lawyer friends in contributing plays. This would help to explain the fact that after the Whitefriars venture proved unsuccessful, he and his friends disappear from the field of dramatic composition.

**Mr. Wallace's Gervase Markham.**—In the *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft* (1910, XLVI, 347–50), Mr. Charles William Wallace has printed two legal documents from the Court of Requests, Public Record Office, London, dated 1623 and relating to a certain Gervase Markham, who in 1622 attempted a journey on foot from London to Berwick, with only a leap-staff for crossing streams. The conditions of the journey are stated as follows:

To goe on ffoote from yo<sup>r</sup>: Ma<sup>tes</sup>: Cyttye of London to yo<sup>r</sup>: Ma<sup>tes</sup>: Towne of Berwicke and that yo<sup>r</sup>: sayd Subiecte in his sayd Intended Iorney shoulde nott goe over any apparente Bridge greate or smale whatsoever and that yo<sup>r</sup> sayd Subiecte should nott in his sayd Intended Iorney vse dyrectlye

<sup>1</sup> *Every Woman*, pp. 343–44.

or indyrectlye any boate, Shippe, or other Ingin for water more then an ordinarye Leape staffe or staffe to leape w<sup>th</sup>all, neither shoulde swyme any water whatsoever.

Thirty-nine persons had bound themselves to pay each a small sum of money (commonly five shillings) to Markham upon the successful accomplishment of the feat. On his return, however, with duly certified proof from the mayor of Berwick, the thirty-nine persons had all "severallye refused to make paymente" of the sums for which they had bound themselves; and Markham prays that they be summoned to appear in court.

A majority of the thirty-nine men who entered into this wager with Markham were actors. (Ten apparently were not;<sup>1</sup> of three others I can find no trace in the records of the drama, although it seems likely that they were obscure members of the theatrical profession.) Accordingly, Mr. Wallace concludes that "these documents unquestionably concern the Gervase Markham of *The Dumb Knight* and *The True Tragedy of Herod and Antipater*"; and he conjectures: "It is possible that we have hitherto erred in ascribing those plays to Gervase Markham, the horseman of Cottam, Nottinghamshire."

But, in view of our present limited knowledge, it seems to me that Mr. Wallace's conclusion and his conjecture are both open to grave doubt. The two documents from the Court of Requests (the first is little more than a list of names, the second a brief statement that Markham's request had been granted) are hardly sufficient in themselves to prove that Markham, the plaintiff in this amusing suit, was "unquestionably" the author of *The Dumb Knight*, written in 1606-7, and of *Herod and Antipater*, written in 1621.<sup>2</sup> It merely

<sup>1</sup> Including two publishers, Trundle and Gosson; "Henry Sheppey, a turner"; and "William Carpenter, porter at the Marshallsey." Broughton seems to be connected with the law, and the two Keyes possibly kept a tavern, the "Cross Keyes."

<sup>2</sup> Sir Sidney Lee in the *D.N.B.* says: "Written probably about 1612." This must be a typographical error for 1621. Professor Schelling assigns the play, correctly, I think, to 1621. The title-page of the first edition (1622) says: "As it hath bene, of late, diuers times publicquely Acted (with great Applause) at the Red Bull, by the Company of his Maiesties Reuels." This company received its license July 8, 1622. Sampson, who collaborated with Markham on the play, was born in 1590. "In 1612," says the *D.N.B.*, "William Sampson, either the dramatist himself, or his father, figured with Thomas and Henry Sampson among the humbler owners of land" in South Leverton, a village near Retford, Nottinghamshire. Later he became a retainer in the family of Sir Henry Willoughby, and with the leisure which this position gave him, was enabled



shows that he secured many actors from the Fortune, the Red Bull, and the Globe to sign his "bill of adventure"; and perhaps we may be warranted in believing that he was personally known to most of them. Again, we cannot be absolutely sure that he was not after all "Gervase Markham, the horseman of Cottam." Let us examine the evidence contained in the documents printed by Mr. Wallace.

(1) The plaintiff describes himself as "Gervase Markham, of London, gent." In 1617, the "horseman," in a signed promise to the booksellers to write no more books "of the Deseases or cures" of horses and cattle of any kind, describes himself similarly as "Gervase Markham, of London, gent." (2) The plaintiff declares that he had "heretofore served his countrye in . . . Ireland and in other Countreyes in the place of a Captaine." Of the horseman, the *D.N.B.* says: "In his early years he followed the career of arms in the Low Countries, and had a captaincy under the Earl of Essex in Ireland." (3) The plaintiff says that he is getting old; but he could not have been very old, for he has "many children and great Charge of Househoulde." The horseman, according to the *D.N.B.*, was born "about 1568," and at the time of the suit, therefore, was about fifty-five years of age. (4) The plaintiff is now "soe verye pore that hee is nott able to vndergoe the Charges of any one of those Suites." This description would certainly not apply to the horseman of Cottam in his earlier years, nor is it in keeping with the generally accepted notion of his later years. But, of his pecuniary state in his old age we seem to be ignorant; at least the *D.N.B.* tells us nothing save that about 1605 he "turned to literature in search of the means of subsistence," and became a "hackney writer for the publishers." It is conceivable that when forced to rely upon the generosity of the London booksellers, he fell into poverty, and by 1623 might well describe himself as "veye pore." In 1617 we find him making the following entry in the register of the Stationers' Company:

Memorandum That I Gervase Markham of London gent Do promise hereafter Never to write any more book or bookes to be printed, of the to turn his attention to literature. He collaborated with Markham on *Herod and Antipater*, the first work of his recorded. His next play, *The Widow's Prize*, was written in 1624; his third play, *The Vow Breaker*, was printed in 1636; and in the same year appeared all of his non-dramatic work. I think, therefore, that the evidence for 1621 as the date of *Herod and Antipater* is well-nigh conclusive.

Deseases or cures of any Cattle, as Horse, Oxe, Cowe, sheepe, Swine, and Goates &c. In witnes whereof I have hereunto sett my hand the 14th Day of Julie. 1617.

GERVIS MARKHAM

Now, as the *Cambridge History of English Literature* puts it, "of the many sides of Markham's literary activity, the most prominent, as well as most congenial, was, without doubt, that dealing with horsemanship and the veterinary art"; yet we find him here forced to "completely forswear his especial hobby." Does this document, then, indicate the beginnings of poverty for the industrious compiler of books on animal husbandry? (5) The plaintiff explains that he has "groune pore" in his old age by reason of his "many children and greate Charge of househoulde." Of the horseman, the *D.N.B.* says: "Markham married . . . but no children are recorded." Yet the absence of information on this point is suspicious; for if another "Gervase Markham, of London, gent." had "many children," it is strange that the records of these were not discovered by any competent investigator of the subject.<sup>1</sup>

I do not wish, however, to assert that the plaintiff and the horseman are the same person; I merely desire to suggest that such is at least a possibility. For it is surely remarkable that two Gervase Markhams, both describing themselves as "of London, gent.," both of virtually the same age, both having served abroad and in Ireland, both having attained the rank of captain, both subsequently turning to literature for a living, and both having friends among the publishers (two publishers are among the persons cited in the documents), should have lived contemporaneously in London for many years, and yet not hitherto have been distinguished. At least more evidence than we now possess is needed to decide the important question raised by Mr. Wallace.

But there are good reasons, I think, for believing that the famous Markham of Cottam was concerned with *The Dumb Knight*. Machin refers to his collaborator in terms of great respect: "Yet having a partner in the wrong, whose worth hath been often approved, I

<sup>1</sup> I may observe here that the date of death, and the place of burial of Markham of Cottam are now open to doubt, if Mr. Wallace has discovered a new "Gervase Markham, of London, gent."; for the burial entry in St. Giles, Cripplegate ("1636 Feb. 3. Jarvis Markham, Gent.") has been supposed to refer to the horseman for the reason that "as there was only one Jarvis or Gervase Markham, there can be no doubt."

count the wrong but half a wrong, because he knowes best how to answer for himself." These words seem more appropriate as applied to the already illustrious man of letters than to the obscure pedestrian discovered by Mr. Wallace. Nor is Markham's conduct in connection with the play unworthy of the great author of *Cottam*. As I have tried to show, he did not write the play in intimate collaboration with Machin, and was not responsible for the obscene sub-plot; and when the play, after having been adversely criticized in its performance, was printed and offered for sale, he promptly had his name removed from the title-page. There is less evidence that he was connected with the later play, *Herod and Antipater*; yet it is at least worth noting that William Sampson, the collaborator in this play, was, like Markham, a Nottinghamshire man. Less important, but also worth noting, is the fact that Langbaine, in his *English Dramatick Poets* (1691), definitely assigned *Herod and Antipater* to the horseman, and was ignorant of the existence of another playwright by the name of Markham. Finally, if the Markham of *Cottam* did not write *The Dumb Knight* and other plays in blank verse, including *Herod and Antipater*, how are we to explain Jonson's remark about him in his conversations with Drummond?

That Markham (who added his English *Arcadia*<sup>1</sup>) was not of the number of the Faithful, *i.e.* *Poets*, and but a base fellow.

It is hardly likely that Jonson at this late date (1619) would notice Markham's early and altogether insignificant poems.

If, however, the mention of poverty and of children in the legal documents is sufficient to warrant us in concluding that the plaintiff in this suit is not to be identified with the Markham of *Cottam*, and if the presence of the names of actors from three playhouses is sufficient to warrant us in believing that the plaintiff was a playwright, we still have to face the possibility that Gervase Markham of *Cottam* wrote *The Dumb Knight* in 1606-7, and that Gervase Markham, the pedestrian, wrote *Herod and Antipater* in 1621. I have not been able to examine this latter play; but in the extensive quotations in Mr. Dunstan's thesis,<sup>2</sup> I can discover little to suggest the style of

<sup>1</sup> A reference to Markham's *The English Arcadia*, alluding to his beginning from *Sir Phil. Sydnes Ending*, 1607.

<sup>2</sup> Arthur Cyril Dunstan, *Examination of Two English Dramas*, Königsberg, 1908.

*The Dumb Knight*. A full and careful study of the play, of course, is necessary to determine this question.

But however the authorship of *Herod and Antipater* may be decided, I must hold that the evidence is reasonably conclusive that Gervase Markham of Cottam was the author of *The Dumb Knight*.

**Textual Notes.**—Since the opportunity of writing on these two plays has fallen in my way, I desire to record a few textual notes and emendations.

*Every Woman*

P. 313, ll. 17–19: The words "All hayle to my belooved," and "Sad dispaire doth drive me hence," are the first lines of songs, according to the humor of Philautus, and should therefore be printed in italics, as elsewhere in the play.

P. 322, II. i. 9: "Bindes favours and now discovering lines." Bullen says: "I am unable to mend this passage." Read as follows: "Blinde favours and new discovering lines." That is, Flavia is constantly sending to Lentulus, who loves her not, secret tokens of her affection, and such lines as he reads at the beginning of the scene: "Yours in modestie, *Flavia*."

P. 325, l. 2: "Her fore-amazing person makes me mute." Read "sore-amazing."

P. 328: "The old senate has put on his spectacles." Read: "The old senator," i.e., Flaminius.

Pp. 329–30, l. 24 to the end of the scene: The catchwords are obviously wrong. Read:

*Ter.* I want one indeede, Wench.

*Flav.* But thou hast two . . . , etc.

After this to the end of the scene the catchwords should be exchanged. Terentia had two suitors (Lentulus and Cicero), not Flavia; moreover, the wanton language clearly indicates which speeches are to be attributed to Flavia. This change renders Bullen's emendation of the text altogether unnecessary, and provides for his attribution of a part of the last speech to Flavia.

P. 346, l. 3: In the original edition this line has been lost; Mr. Bullen supplies in brackets: "Say, is it Lentulus?" It is more likely that the words were: "What, hath Lentulus——" Cf.

l. 6: "What, hath Terentia——" and l. 10: "What, hath my father——"; and the balancing throughout the whole passage.

P. 359, l. 28: "And then to *Apollo* hollo, trees, hollo." This should be printed as a song (i.e., in italics); Philautus awakes, true to his humor, with a song on his lips.

P. 364, ll. 2-4: "I have no Varlets, no knaves, no stewd prunes, no she fierie phagies." For the last two words read "*ferie facies*." The same pun is made on p. 368: "For hee's [a drunkard is] never without a *ferie facies*."

### *The Dumb Knight*

P. 144, last line: For "cast" read "casts"?

P. 152, ll. 4-7: Beyond all doubt these lines should be given to Epire.

P. 158, l. 6: The modern editor alters the original reading "my" to "thy"; but cf. pp. 133, 151.

P. 162, l. 11: The modern editor alters the original reading, "loves" to "laws"; but the original reading is doubtless correct; cf. the last four lines on p. 144.

P. 180, l. 3: "And I'll defend them [women] against all men, as at single tongue." Omit the word "as."

P. 194, l. 6: The emendation of this line to "My dearest, dreadest, my best sovereign" is quite unnecessary. The original reading (relegated to the footnotes), "My dearest dread, my best, best sovereign," is better meter and better poetry. Cf. Spenser's: "Una, his dear dread."

P. 200, last two lines of the play:

Thus storms bring gentle sunshine, and our hands  
May, after shipwreck, bring us to safe lands.

For "our" read "your."

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS, JR.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY